

**REMARKS**

The Office Action rejects claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph; and rejects claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Applicants amend claims 1 and 18, and traverse the rejections. No new matter is added.

Entry of the amendments is proper under 37 CFR §1.116 since the amendments: (a) place the application in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed herein; (b) do not raise any new issue requiring further search and/or consideration as the amendments amplify issues previously discussed throughout prosecution; (c) satisfy a requirement of form asserted in the previous Office Action; (d) do not present any additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims; and (e) place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. The amendments are necessary and were not earlier presented because e.g. they are made in response to arguments raised in the final rejection. Entry of the amendments is thus respectfully requested.

**I. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112**

The Office Action rejects claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. The Office Action alleges that the terms "real space", "real place" and "non-simulated" constitute new matter. Applicants hereby traverse the rejection.

As noted on, for example, line 6 of page 9 of the specification as filed, an activity event of each object in a common work space in an *actual* world is detected." Likewise, references to the word "actual" occur throughout the specification, for example, at page 11, line 13, and so on. It is clear from these references that "non-simulated", "real space", and "real place", are not new matter and refer to actual, non-simulated environments.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claims 1-21 do not contain new matter. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are earnestly solicited.

## II. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Office Action rejects claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Toomey et al. in view of Hamada et al. The Office Action asserts that Toomey teaches each feature of instant claims 1-21, except for "presentation information apparatus of an object that include live video image and sound of a detected user event activity," which is allegedly taught by Hamada. It would thus allegedly be obvious to an ordinarily skilled artisan at the time of the invention to modify Toomey by Hamada in order to "enhancement a presentation software." Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Instant claims 1-21 include references to *non-simulated real space*. In other words, for example, objects in real spaces conduct activity events, which can be individually detected and saved in relation to the time and real place for *each object* where each object conducts the detected activity event. Moreover, captured data of an activity event can be controlled in relation to the activity event and displayed based on the degree of relation between objects. See the specification, as filed, at pages 6 and 7.

In contrast, as discussed at length in Applicant's previous responses and admitted by the Office Action, Toomey is directed toward a *virtual space*. Moreover, the Office Action incorrectly asserts that Hamada teaches the claimed non-simulated real space. The Office Action points to Hamada, Fig. 24 and col. 33, lines 55-59 for this proposition; however, there is no indication in either of those references that Hamada actually discloses the instant features. Rather, lines 55-59 of col. 33 simply teach that displayed animation can be substituted for a video image, recorded sound, or other combination *with animation*. Further, none of the references throughout the sixth embodiment, to which lines 55-59 refer, teach or suggest activities, devices, or methods that involve the claimed non-simulated real space, which include various media and functionality beyond simple video and audio playback. Thus, Hamada's simple disclosure of displaying animation does not remedy Toomey's

deficiencies with respect to the instant independent claims, or those depending therefrom. Further, there would have been no motivation to combine Toomey with Hamada because doing so would not have obtained the claimed features.

For at least the foregoing reasons, instant claims 1-21 would not have been obvious obvious over Toomey in view of Hamada. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are earnestly solicited.

**I. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Ryan C. Cady  
Registration No. 56,762

JAO:RCC/amw

Date: May 23, 2007

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--